

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. This communication is a first Office action Non-Final rejection on the merits.

Claims 1-10 as originally filed, are currently pending and have been considered below

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101***

2. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

3. Claims 1-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 1-9 fail to fall within one statutory category.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

5. Claims 1-6, 9, 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The claims are replete with errors, a few examples follow:

Claim 1 recites the limitation "the internet" in line 1. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 1 recites the limitation "the employee" in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 1 recites the limitation "the company" in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 1 recites the limitation "the consumer" in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 1 recites the limitation "the factory" in line 3. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 1 recites the limitation "the media" in line 4. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 1 recites the limitation "the ordering" in line 4. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 2 recites the limitation "the boss" in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 2 recites the limitation "the result" in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 3 recites the limitation "the i.d." in line 4. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

In Claims 3, 5, and 6 recites the limitation "he could" and "his" renders the claim indefinite since it does not positively set forth the claimed limitation. What is the "he" referred to?

Claim 10 recites the limitation "the verifier" in line 1. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 10 recites the limitation "the warehouse" in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

The term "its" in claims 1 and 6 is a relative term which renders the claim indefinite. The term "its" is not defined by the claim, the specification does not provide a standard for ascertaining the requisite degree, and one of ordinary skill in the art would not be reasonably apprised of the scope of the invention. The term "its" is rendered indefinite because "its" does not describe what is fabricated.

The term "it" in claims 4, 5, and 9 is a relative term which renders the claim indefinite. The term "it" is not defined by the claim, the specification does not provide a standard for ascertaining the requisite degree, and one of ordinary skill in the art would not be reasonably apprised of the scope of the invention. The term "it" is rendered indefinite because "it" does not describe who or what can query the result.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

7. Claims 1-5, 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Miller et al. (US 2002/0026369).

**As per claim 1**, Miller et al. teaches a system and method for contract authority, said system including

an operating mechanism of ordering monitor feedback achieved through the internet (see paragraph 0040 via Internet) for the employee in the company (see paragraph 43 via user), the consumer (see paragraph 0216 via consumer of the product) that orders, and the factory (see paragraph 0093 via entity) to login said web site (see paragraph 0137 via website) through the such that said company become the media between the ordering consumer and the factory (see paragraph 0040 via communication medium) through the setting up of the internet; said ordering consumer could login said web site through login (see paragraph 0113 via user identifier) the internet and inputs the ordering information (see paragraph 0046 via request or purchase) to the company that provides the web site directly on the web site, said company will come to the place where it was assigned by the consumer according to the ordering information input by the consumers and to input said result of product quality verification (see paragraph 0258 via adds up to an improved quality) and the data of the verifier onto said web site through the internet so that remote consumer, company employee, as well as the factory being verified its fabricated products will login said web site anytime to check and view the condition of such products to better the quality (see paragraph 0293 via clientside performance is improved) of the commercial products according to the yield and the rate of inferior by improving the condition of fabrication.

**As per claim 2**, Miller et al. further teaches a system and method, wherein if the login user is the boss of that company, despite of looking at the result of the product quality verification, he also has the right to look into the unit price of

that products (see paragraph 0044 via report a price of the product ) as well as the total amounts of money on such entrust business to understand the income of that company (see paragraph 0124 via income level and other information).

**As per claim 3**, Miller et al. further teaches a system and method, wherein said employee of that company, the ordering consumer, and the factory being verified (see paragraph 0127 via Personal identifying information can be used to confirm) his fabricated product should input an identification password on login, through such identification password it could recognize the i.d. of the user, besides, the factory could only have their identification password (see paragraph 0103 via Various security strategies) upon the agreement of their ordering consumer.

**As per claim 4**, Miller et al. further teaches a system and method, wherein if it is judged that the login user is the company employee, it could check up to see if there is any ordering information or it can query the result of the quality verification of the products through input the ordering number (see paragraph 0227 via account number) or uploading the inferior goods information (see paragraph 0214 via uploading at least one of text, video, and audio).

**As per claim 5**, Miller et al. further teaches a system and method, wherein if it is judged that the login user is the consumer, he could only perform the input of the ordering information (see paragraph 0158 via order for the product) as well as to query the result of the quality verification of the entrust products (see paragraph 0153 via the result is a database).

**As per claim 10**, Miller et al. further teaches a system and method,

wherein the verifier could be the warehouse (see paragraph 0045 via the merchant/producer may supply) of that ordering consumer.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims 6-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miller et al. in view of Davis et al. (US 2006/0149653).

**As per claim 6**, Miller et al. teaches a system and method of manufacture for matching products to a textual request for product information.

However, Miller et al. fails to disclose wherein said verified could be a factory, when the web site judgment judges that the user is a verifier, said verifier could only view its own verification report of his verified products.

Davis et al. in the same field of endeavor discloses a method and system for online sales and purchase wherein said verified could be a factory (see claim 41 via authenticating includes inspecting the content), when the web site judgment judges that the user is a verifier, said verifier could only view its own verification report of his verified products (see paragraph 24 via verifies that the current user is a valid event participant).

Therefore, from this teaching of Davis et al. it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of manufacture for matching products to a textual request for product information of Miller

et al. to include to include a method and system for online sales and service as taught by Davis et al. for the purpose of verifying the identification of the website user.

**As per claim 7**, Miller et al. teaches a system and method of manufacture for matching products to a textual request for product information

However Miller et al. fails to disclose, wherein when said company, the verified looks at the result of the quality verification of the products, said report could be sub-classified as the daily report, the monthly report as well as the annual report.

Davis et al. in the same field of endeavor discloses a method and system for online sales and purchase wherein when said company, the verified looks at the result of the quality verification of the products (see paragraph 0010 via important considerations as quantity discounts, contributed advertising dollars, shipping terms, payment terms, quality, scheduling of deliveries, and such other terms and conditions as may be commonly a part of a purchase contract in the particular business or industry), said report could be sub-classified as the daily report, the monthly report as well as the annual report (see paragraph 0035 via various proposals).

Therefore, from this teaching of Davis et al. it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of manufacture for matching products to a textual request for product information of Miller et al. to include to include a method and system for online sales and service as taught by Davis et al. for the purpose of retrieving usage reports.

**As per claim 8**, Miller et al. teaches a system and method of manufacture for matching products to a textual request for product information

However Miller et al. fails to disclose, wherein when said company, the verified looks at the result of the quality verification of the products, said report could be sub-classified as the daily report, the monthly report, the annual report as well as analysis report.

Davis et al. in the same field of endeavor discloses a method and system for online sales and purchase wherein when said company, the verified looks at the result Of the quality verification of the products, said report could be sub-classified as the daily report, the monthly report, the annual report as well as analysis report (see paragraph 0035 via analysis webpage he or she has received can be viewed side-by-side for comparison).

Therefore, from this teaching of Davis et al. it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of manufacture for matching products to a textual request for product information of Miller et al. to include to include a method and system for online sales and service as taught by Davis et al. for the purpose of retrieving usage reports as well as analysis reports.

**As per claim 9**, Miller et al. teaches a system and method of manufacture for matching products to a textual request for product information.

However, Miller et al. fails to disclose wherein the content of said quality verification comprises examining, testing, classification, rework or repair, whereas the job content comprises the time of examine, the number of fine products, the number of inferior products, the total number, the rate of inferior, the number of products examined for each verifier, the number of product verification per hour, etc; and it could view the



verifier data, the inferior damage data as well as the figure in the result of the product verification.

Davis et al. in the same field of endeavor discloses a method and system for online sales and purchase wherein the content of said quality verification comprises examining, testing, classification, rework or repair, whereas the job content comprises the time of examine, the number of fine products, the number of inferior products, the total number, the rate of inferior, the number of products examined for each verifier, the number of product verification per hour, etc; and it could view the verifier data, the inferior damage data as well as the figure in the result of the product verification (see paragraph 0010 via but such further important considerations as quantity discounts, contributed advertising dollars, shipping terms, payment terms, quality, scheduling of deliveries, and such other terms and conditions as may be commonly a part of a purchase contract in the particular business or industry).

Therefore, from this teaching of Davis et al. it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of manufacture for matching products to a textual request for product information of Miller et al. to include to include a method and system for online sales and service as taught by Davis et al. for the purpose of quality verification.

***Conclusion***

**10.** The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Flanagan et al. (US 7222109) discloses a system and method for contract authority.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to KRUNAL PATEL whose telephone number is (571)270-5099. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday, 7:30AM-5PM and First Fridays Off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lynda Jasmin can be reached on (571) 270-3033. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

KDP

/Lynda Jasmin/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 4127